

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Applied:

746 infants and toddlers with IFSPs received the early interventions services on their IFSPs in a timely manner;

764 total infants and toddlers with IFSPs

$746/764 \times 100 = 98.64\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 97.64%

Alaska Part C data are for all eligible children with IFSPs and includes data for the entire reporting year (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010). These data are from a State database.

Alaska included 13 children for whom the state identified the cause for delay as “exceptional family circumstances” in both the numerator and the denominator for this indicator. One child did not receive timely services due to weather; this child is accounted for in the number of children who did not receive timely services.

Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive Early Intervention Services in a Timely Manner:

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	746
b. Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	764
c. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	98%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Alaska Part C indicator 1, timely services, has increased from 86.5% in FFY 2008 to 98% in FFY 2009. Alaska Part C identified noncompliance prior to FFY 2008 through cyclical on-site monitoring. Alaska Part C currently reports on findings identified through analysis of annual census data collected by its Part C database. The implementation of new quarterly and annual compliance reports for local EIS programs and state staff have contributed to improved and timely technical assistance and monitoring. Local EIS programs with findings of noncompliance in FFY 2009 received:

- on-site monitoring visits
- corrective action plans
- local EIS staff training (IDEA Part C requirements and Alaska Part C database management)
- on-site technical assistance including monthly file review and
- quarterly progress reporting.

Alaska Part C also provided the following general supervision activities statewide FFY 2009:

- monthly Part C/EIS coordinator teleconferences
- monthly database teleconferences
- annual EIS coordinator face to face meeting
- annual EIS staff training opportunities
- initiation of Part C professional competency registration.

Alaska Part C verified that timely services were received for 100% of children with IFSPs for at least one quarter following the implementation of a corrective action plan. Consistent with the OSEP 09-02 Memo, Alaska Part C verified that each EIS program corrected noncompliance by reviewing data. This data demonstrated that programs correctly implemented regulatory requirements.

While Alaska Part C did not meet the target of 100%, an overall progress trend is evident from FFY 2004 to FFY 2009. Note: FFY07 was the first year of Alaska's new timely services definition. Extensive training with local EIS programs increased compliance in the following two years.

Indicator 1 Progress Table						
<i>Measurable and Rigorous Target 2008-2009</i>	Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009	Actual Data FFY09 2009-2010
100%	85%	84%	84%	54%	86.5%	98%

Alaska Part C collected data on the number of days late and delay reasons for each child who did not receive timely services in its Part C database. Alaska defines timely services as those "IFSP services initiated on or before the IFSP initiation date as established by the IFSP team, including parent".

Range of Days Late (excludes Family Circumstances)

FFY 2009	Number of Children	Percent of Children
1 to 7 Days	5	28%
8 to 30 Days	8	44%
31 to 90 Days	3	17%
> 90 Days	1	5.5%
Missing Contact Data	1*	5.5%
Total	18	100%

*One child missed an occupational therapy visit due to provider vacancy. An occupational therapy position was advertised and a new OT hired and scheduled to start early in FFY 2010. This agency is a rural agency in western Alaska with few resources. This agency sought additional OT contract support through local hospital, school and private therapist during the vacancy without success. This child's services are a priority for the new OT. Special education support was provided in a timely way and without interruption.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 86.5%

a. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009)	7
b. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (verified as corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	7
c. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

a. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
b. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
c. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2008 (indicator 1) findings.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent): Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2008 indicator 1 findings.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

Alaska Part C verified that timely services were received for 100% of children with IFSPs for at least one quarter following the implementation of a corrective action plan. Consistent with the OSEP 09-02 Memo, Alaska Part C verified that each EIS program corrected noncompliance by reviewing data. This data demonstrated that programs correctly implemented regulatory requirements.

Local EIS programs with findings of noncompliance in FFY 2008 received:

- on-site and distance technical assistance
- IDEA Part C requirements clarification
- corrective action plans (CAP)
- on-site monitoring visits if local EIS CAP progress reports did not support timely improvement
- Alaska Part C database management training
- quarterly APR Indicator progress reporting.

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:

Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2007 (indicator 1) findings.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: Alaska Part C does not have any remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007. All noncompliance has been corrected.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance:

All FFY 2006 indicator 1 findings were subsequently corrected.

a. Number of remaining uncorrected FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2010, FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	1
b. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has verified as corrected	1
c. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier:

Alaska Part C verified correction of 1 EIS program through on-site monitoring, desk audit, monthly file reviews and local EIS quarterly reporting. The EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the Alaska FFY 2008 data reported for this indicator: (1) has documented and consistently demonstrated correction with implementing 100% timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) based on updated data through the state data system; and (2) initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner (unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006:

The State team conducted a root cause analysis with the local EIS program. Alaska Part C revised the local EIS corrective action plan. Monthly State technical assistance was provided to review local EIS child files, documentation, provider practice and data management. Numerous state database enhancements were discussed and as a result, improvements made to data management reports. Missing data were corrected/entered and additional database training/support provided. The local EIS program reviewed current IFSPs, procedural safeguards and regulations with parents who had late services. The local EIS reported progress to the state quarterly.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR due February 1, 2011, that the State is in compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p>	<p>All Alaska Part C FFY 2008 noncompliance was verified as corrected within 12 months of findings.</p>
<p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>Alaska Part C reports in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and the Part C State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for all children whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>Alaska Part C reports, in the FFY 2009 APR, the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>Alaska Part C has corrective action plans currently in place for each local EIS program with FFY 2009 indicator 1, (timely services) findings. Alaska Part C and Alaska Early Intervention Council have reviewed this indicator for revision to improvement activities. These revisions are noted in the FFY 2009 APR (indicator 1 – discussion of improvement activities completed).</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010: The following improvement strategies are also found in the Alaska SPP. Changes to the Alaska SPP 2009 and 2010 Indicator 1 improvement activities and measurement:

Original SPP 2009-2010 Improvement Activity	Proposed Improvement Activity Change	Justification for Improvement Activity Change
<p>2010</p> <p>State EI/ILP staff will engage in continued oversight of the delivery of timely services that will include data review on a quarterly and yearly basis in addition to our on-site cyclical monitoring capability.</p>	<p>State EI/ILP staff will engage in continued oversight of the delivery of timely services that will include data review on a quarterly and yearly basis in addition to our monitoring capability. Findings will be identified and issued within the current fiscal year.</p> <p>Alaska Part C will continue to work with the ICC to advocate for funding to increase the use of tele-practice to improve service delivery in rural Alaska. Alaska Part C will continue to participate on the Council's Rural Services Ad Hoc committee to explore tele-practice options in Alaska.</p>	<p>Alaska replaced a cyclical on-site monitoring system with an annual focused monitoring system in FFY08.</p> <p>Earlier finding identification allows Alaska Part C system to correct noncompliance within the following fiscal year for timely correction verification and APR reporting.</p> <p>Tele-practice is being explored for improved service delivery for rural and remote communities in collaboration with the Alaska ICC.</p>

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Applied:

673 Infants and toddlers enrolled with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings
675 of infants and toddlers with IFSPs
 $673/675 \times 100 = 99.7\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	95%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 99.7%

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children enrolled with IFSP in the state on December 1, 2009. This is the same data reported under Section 618.

Two families received services in other settings (local EIS offices) due to 1) homelessness and 2) a family move to another home; family requested services in local EIS office until move completed (received services in natural environment once settled).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Alaska's FFY 2009 actual target exceeds the state measurable target of 95%. Alaska's data system incorporates user reports that aid local EIS and state EI staff monitor the provision of services in the natural environment. Alaska's monitoring system ensures that services not held in the natural environment are settings determined most appropriate to meet the needs of the child.

Indicator 2 Progress Table					
Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009	Actual Data FFY09 2009-2010
93.4%	94.5%	95.1%	95.8%	95.8%	99.7%

Alaska provided the following improvement activities in FFY09:

- State EI/ILP staff reviewed local EIS data to ensure compliance.
- Key stakeholders reviewed trend data and provided feedback on strategies or changes needed to improve delivery of services in the natural environment.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

Changes to the Alaska SPP 2009-2010 Indicator 2 improvement activities and measurement:

Original SPP 2009 Improvement Activity	Proposed Improvement Activity Change	Justification for Improvement Activity Change
2010 - State EI/ILP staff will continue to work with each program on QIPs, based on on-site monitor review data as well as the use and review of quarterly and year end data, to ensure compliance between cyclical on-site monitoring.	State EI/ILP staff will provide technical assistance and monitoring oversight of each EIS program assisting with Corrective Action Plan development to ensure indicator compliance.	Corrective Action Plans align with Alaska's new focused monitoring system and promote root cause analysis of indicators below 95% targets.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments****Indicator 3:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d) divided by [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

FFY 2009	Measurable and Rigorous Target
Summary Statements	Targets for FFY 2009 (% of children)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	60%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	52%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	66%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	46%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	62%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	46%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009

Progress Data for Infants and Toddlers Exiting 2009-2010

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	# of children	% of children
a) Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	8	2.43%
b) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	72	21.88%
c) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	60	18.24%
d) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	94	28.57%
e) Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	95	28.88%
Total	N = 329	100%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	# of children	% of children
a) Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	4	1.22%
b) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	76	23.10%
c) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	88	26.75%
d) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	103	31.31%
e) Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	58	17.63%
Total	N = 329	100%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	# of children	% of children
a) Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	9	2.74%
b) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	64	19.45%
c) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	87	26.44%
d) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	98	29.79%
e) Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	71	21.58%
Total	N = 329	100%

Summary Statement Data for Infants and Toddlers Exiting 2009-2010:

Summary Statements	% of children
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	65.81% (154 of 234)
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	57.45% (189 of 329)
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	70.48% (191 of 271)

2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	48.94% (161 of 329)
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	71.71% (185 of 258)
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	51.37% (169 of 329)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

FFY 2009 is the first year of target data. Alaska Part C exceeded its measurable and rigorous target in all summary statement categories for Infants and Toddlers Exiting 2009-2010.

FFY 2009 Child Outcomes		
Summary Statements	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	60%	65.81%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	52%	57.45%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	66%	70.48%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	46%	48.94%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	62%	71.71%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	46%	51.37%

The above target percentages were set based on analysis of existing data, using the Part C data system. Characteristics of children in baseline data were considered and local program data was examined to determine the possible impact of outliers on the statewide data. It was determined that the few local programs with either extremely low percentages or extremely high percentages on the two outcome statements in each of the outcome areas did not have a significant impact on statewide percentages due to the very small number of exiting children in these programs. In

fact, because of the very small numbers in several of these rural programs, no meaning could be applied to these local summary percentages other than probable effect of individual child characteristics influencing their progress ratings.

Current year percentages are considered a rigorous and ambitious target for 2012. Alaska suspects that baseline percentages are higher than we may expect for future years due to the fact that very few of the children with outcome data reported in 2010 were enrolled in the program before one year of age, and therefore might be expected to have less significant impairments that might impede their progress and lower their COSF ratings. Based on preliminary statistical analyses, it appears that several factors may have a negative impact on child outcome data, including certain diagnoses, and greater levels of delay at initial evaluation. More in-depth analysis is needed to ascertain the actual impact of such factors on child outcomes. For these reasons along with the significantly lower percentages calculated on preliminary data reported for FFY2009, Alaska expects to look closely at data trends, population and program characteristics that may impact outcome data in the coming year.

Alaska Part C completed the following activities to improve child outcomes data quality and monitoring. The outcome system is now included in the state's monitoring process. The data reported are evaluated for accuracy and timeliness. The EI/ILP database has built-in edit checks to prevent knowable errors (dates, scores, missing data).

When the data are analyzed, reports are produced by the state describing the results of the measurement system. Programs with unexpected results are contacted by the state staff to determine the reason and an appropriate corrective action. Access to the EI/ILP data system is limited to specified state and local program staff.

The data fields related to this measurement system are incorporated into the current EI/ILP database for the least amount of impact possible on program staff while considering the most effective means of data quality.

Each local EIS program has a number of standard reports related to the outcome measurement system to help with tracking, viewing and reporting their outcome data. Statewide analysis is completed by the state staff as required and at least annually.

Ongoing Improvement Activities

- Database reports continue to be developed and refined to improve COSF data management and analysis capabilities at the state and local level.
- State staff and other stakeholders continue active participation in ECO Center training and teleconferences.
- The state has a service agreement with the University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities at University of Alaska to assist with analysis of the statewide COSF data.
- ECO Center Powerpoint presentations have been adapted to include Alaska data charts and to train local program coordinators and other stakeholders on the process of data analysis for target setting.
- Stakeholder input on issues related to target setting is gathered during statewide presentations and discussions.
- Training on the COSF process is provided jointly for Part C and 619 local agency staff at the annual statewide special education conference (ASSEC) each year. This promotes collaboration and consistency of child outcome measurement across the two programs.
- On-site record reviews by state technical assistance staff continue to be conducted to assure consistency and accuracy of COSF data and to provide specific feedback and ongoing training and technical assistance for local providers.

- Alaska has been accepted as one of two TACSEI partner states in 2010-2012. This means that early intervention providers and care givers will receive in depth training and coaching on evidence-based practices to promote the social-emotional development of young children. It is anticipated that the improved practices resulting from this training will lead to increases in the number of children who make significant progress and/or attain functional skills comparable to age level peers by the time they exit the Part C program.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010: There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

Applied:

- A. 59 respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights
65 respondent families participating in Part C
 $59/65 \times 100 = 90.8\%$
- B. 59 respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs
65 respondent families participating in Part C
 $59/65 \times 100 = 90.8\%$
- C. 60 respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn
65 respondent families participating in Part C
 $60/65 \times 100 = 92.3\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
2009	A. Know their rights;	100%
	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs;	100%
	C. Help their children develop and learn.	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009:

A. Percent of responding families who indicated EI has done an excellent job helping them know their rights all or most of the time.	90.8%
B. Percent of responding families who indicated EI had done an excellent job helping them effectively communicate their children's needs all or most of the time.	90.8%
C. Percent of responding families who indicated EI helped them to help their children develop and learn all or most of the time.	92.3%

Data for this indicator is the result of a statewide family outcomes survey conducted by a third-party evaluator, the University of Alaska Anchorage Center for Human Development (CHD). CHD was contracted to implement the FFY 2009 survey of families with children who had received EI/ILP services from January 1 to December 31, 2008. The methodology of the FFY 2008 Family Outcomes Survey utilized a randomly selected target group, stratified geographically (by ILP grantee).

Representativeness of the Response Group

In the FFY 2007 APR, Alaska reported that Native Americans were underrepresented in the FFY 2007 response group. To address this problem, Alaska revised its sampling plan for indicator 4 outcome survey following approval by OSEP in Feb. 2008. As approved by OSEP, the survey protocol utilized a revision of the scale first used in FFY 2007, simplifying some wording, resolving compound items, and adding new items. The protocol used the same 4-point Likert scale recommended for improved cultural appropriateness for Alaska's indigenous populations. Families were asked to rate experiences with their children and EI/ILP on 21 statements by choosing how often each statement was true for their family: none of the time, some of the time, most of the time, or all of the time.

A target group of 120 families was randomly selected from those including at least one child who not only received services in 2008, but was also eligible for Part C and had been enrolled in the program for at least 6 months. The survey and letter of introduction were mailed to the target group of families, inviting them to complete the survey by mail, online, or over the phone. There were 62 completed surveys rendering a 52% response rate.

Characteristics of responding families were compared with the randomly selected target group and the total eligible population of service recipients. Similarity across all three lent increased confidence that as a group, responders could be considered representative of all eligible families receiving ILP services during 2008. Though the target group of families was not stratified by race/ethnicity, there was no indication of an under-representation of families with Native children as there had appeared to be in previous survey years.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Family Outcomes Improvement Trends	FFY 2008	FFY 2009
Know their rights	88.7%	90.8%
Effectively communicate their children's needs	91.9%	90.8%
Help their children develop and learn	88.5%	92.3%

It can be concluded from the results of the FFY 2009 survey that there was an overall high level of satisfaction with the EI/ILP services from families receiving services under Part C eligibility. There were no significant differences within FFY 2009 responses based on race/ethnicity of children or area of residence. This overall result has been consistent across all survey years.

Know their rights:

Percent of responding families who indicated EI has done an excellent job helping them know their rights all or most of the time was one of the two strongest outcome areas in the FFY 2009 results. Two items within this outcome added in FFY 2008 covered required procedures: asking parents for consent before sharing records, and informing parents of a right to choose services. In a discussion of the FFY 2008 results with ILP providers at their annual conference, these two items were of particular concern. Local EIS providers were certain they followed these procedures, yet acknowledged that a number of caregivers did not perceive consistent attention to these details. The providers concluded they needed to review these procedures more often, during periodic meetings with caregivers. It seems providers were successful implementing this strategy, as there was marked improvement on both items in the FFY 2009 survey. The mean rating on the item about consent was by far the highest in the whole survey, followed by the mean rating on the item about the right to participating in meetings with professionals, also in this outcome area. This item showed significant improvement from 2008 to 2010. The item about knowing what to do if not satisfied with services was not weak, but not as strong within the outcome area. The weakest item in this outcome was being informed about which services are available, which was among the weaker items on the whole survey.

Effectively communicate their children's needs:

Parental understanding of children was overall a strong and consistent outcome area across 2008, 2009, and 2010. There was no indication of significant improvement or significant deterioration from one survey year to the next, or from 2008 to 2010. The lowest response item relative to other items within Outcome 1 indicated lower parental confidence understanding children's special needs

Help their children develop and learn:

Parental ability to help children develop and learn results were relatively weaker and similar to the previous two years. Consistently, the weakest result within this outcome area indicated caregivers needed much more help in knowing how to improve their children's behavior.

Other:

Satisfaction with EI services was one of the two highest outcome areas on the FFY 2009 survey. There was not any significant change in this area from 2009, but one item (helping caregivers know their rights) maintained a higher rating that had been a significant improvement from 2008. Added to surveys were largely expressions of gratitude and compliments. In the mixed and negative comments, there was an indication that follow-up was sometimes problematic. Long wait times for services stood out this year. Any indication of issues that might be addressed by targeted intervention was shared with the EI/ILP office.

Issues to consider:

1. Can the caregivers who have weak social resources be identified? How can they be

helped to build natural, mutual systems of assistance? If this is not possible, what else can be done to help them meet basic needs for occasional childcare and other assistance?

2. How can families be better informed about the array of potential services that are available for their child?

3. How can parents learn more about their children's special needs and how to help their children to be well behaved?

4. Is there a need to focus more attention on wait times for services?

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find****Indicator 5:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddler birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to national data.**Applied:**

164 infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs

11,347 Alaska population of infants and toddlers birth to 1

 $164/11,347 * 100 = 1.45\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	1.3%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 1.45%

Alaska's actual target 1.45% is above the state measurable target of 1.3%. These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children enrolled with IFSPs in the state on December 1, 2008. This is the same data reported under Section 618.

EI/ILP strives to provide services to all infants and toddlers with developmental delays and or disabilities who qualify for services. Alaska defines Part C eligible children as those children who experience a significant developmental delay (at or greater than 50% in one or more developmental domains: cognitive, physical, communication, social/emotional, or adaptive) or those children who have an identified condition that would result in a significant delays. Overall, 43% of all enrolled children in FFY09 were under the age of one.

Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to National data

Alaska's percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPS, under IDEA, Part C is above (1.45%) the national average (1.03%) point-in-time December 1, 2009

Percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C, by Alaska compared to National Part C: 2009			
National and State	Number served Birth to 1 yr.	Number Birth to 1 yr. Population	Percentage Birth to 1 yr. Population
Alaska	164	11,347	1.45%
National (US and outlying areas)	44, 341	4,314,824	1.03%

Sources: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS), OMB #1820-0557: "Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services in Accordance with Part C," 2009. Data updated as of August 3, 2010.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Alaska demonstrates an increase in birth to one population served from 1.02% in FFY08 to 1.45% in FFY09. This is an overall increase for the past six years.

Indicator 5 Progress Table Age Enrolled - Birth to One					
Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009	Actual Data FFY09 2009-2010
0.8%	0.93%	0.76%	1.14%	1.02%	1.45%

Alaska continued the following improvement activities in FFY09:

- Plans for local outreach were developed based on the local provider needs, resources, and evidence of effective child find and incorporated into CAPs as needed.
- State EI/ILP staff reviewed year end data with each program to review numbers of children enrolled and strategies to increase enrollment for infants and their families in need of services.
- Public awareness materials were distributed statewide to ensure that program information is disseminated in a variety of ways including: program participation in health fairs, state wide conferences, brochures, parent mail outs, and web-based.
- A new Alaska Part C state web site design was initiated and continues in the design stages.
- State EI/ILP staff provided technical assistance to local EIS programs for corrective action planning, based on monitor data, as well as the use and review of quarterly and year end data to ensure compliance.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find****Indicator 6:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddler birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.**Applied:**

675 infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs

33,734 Alaska population of infants and toddlers birth to 3

 $675/33,734 \times 100 = 2\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	2.6%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 2%

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children enrolled with IFSPs in the state on December 1, 2009. This is the same data reported under Section 618, collected on Table 1 of Information Collection 1820-0557. Alaska's actual target 2% is slightly below the state measurable target of 2.6%.

Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to National data

Alaska's percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C is below the national average of the birth to three year old population, point-in-time December 1, 2009.

Percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C, by Alaska compared to National Part C: 2008			
National and State	Number served Birth to 3 yr.	Number Birth to 3 yr. Population	Percentage Birth to 3 yr. Population
Alaska	675	33,734	2%
National (US and outlying areas)	348,604	13,055,982	2.67%

Sources: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS), OMB #1820-0557: "Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services in Accordance with Part C," 2009. Data updated as of August 3, 2010.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

EI/ILP strives to provide services to all infants and toddlers with developmental delays and or disabilities who qualify for services. Alaska defines Part C eligible children as those children who experience a significant developmental delay (at or greater than 50% in one or more developmental domains: cognitive, physical, communication, social/emotional, or adaptive) or those children who have an identified condition that would result in a significant delays.

Indicator 6 Progress Table						
Birth to Three Percent of Population and Actual December 1 Enrollment						
	Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Percent and Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Percent and Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Percent and Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Percent and Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009	Percent and Actual Data FFY08 2009-2010
Birth to Three Percent of Population	2.0%	2.09%	1.96%	1.94%	1.79%	2.0%
Actual December 1 Enrollment	610	642	595	620	576	675
Birth to Three Population	30,262	30,101	30,328	31,502	32,215	33,734

The December 1, 2009, point-in-time demonstrates an increase in percent of birth to three population served. ILP records show that Alaska Part C, realized an overall five-year trend increase of annual Part C enrollment.

Enrollment Trends	FFY05	FFY06	FFY07	FFY08	FFY09
Total annual Part C enrollment	1350	1308	1406	1458	1436

Alaska continued the following improvement activities in FFY09:

- Alaska local EIS Programs submitted annual child find plans for regional outreach. Alaska's new monitoring system requires local EIS programs to report child find activities. Referral and enrollment rates are reviewed quarterly by state EI staff.
- Alaska Part C began initial planning statewide universal screening activities for implementation in FFY 2010.
- State EI/ILP staff reviewed year-end data with each local EIS program. Numbers of children enrolled and strategies to increase enrollment for infants in need of services and their families are identified and implemented. Annual corrective action plans incorporate child find goals as necessary.
- Public awareness strategies were evaluated to ensure that program information is disseminated in a variety of ways including: program participation in health fairs, state wide conferences, brochures, parent mail outs, and web-based.

- State EI/ILP reviewed indicator targets with the ICC and provider organization to identify potential strategies of improvement or to review targets. Strategies and discussion for this indicator continue.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009: There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

Applied:

653 eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline

657 of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted

$653/657 \times 100 = 99.39\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 99%

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted in the state during the reporting period (FFY 2009). Data reported for this indicator prior to FFY 2008, were collected on a sample of children through cyclical onsite monitoring.

Infants Evaluated and Assessed and provided an Initial IFSP meeting Within Part C's 45-day timeline:

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	653
b. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	657

c. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	99%
--	-----

Children for whom delays are attributable to circumstances other than documented exceptional family circumstances, whether in the EIS program's control or outside the EIS program's control, are included in the denominator of the Alaska Part C calculation.

Alaska Part C collected data on the number of days late and delay reasons for each child for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was not conducted within the 45-day timeline in its Part C database.

FFY 09 4 Children	Number of children	Percent of children
1 to 7 Days	0	0%
8 to 30 Days	0	0%
31 to 90 Days	4*	100%
>90 Days	0	0%
FY 09 Total	4	100%

*Reasons for delays (4) include service coordinator unavailability, evaluator unavailability and staff training needs.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY09:

Alaska demonstrates improvement for indicator 7 at 99.39% in FFY 2009 compared to 93.04% in FFY 2008. This improvement can be attributed to the extensive technical assistance, database training and development of database reports which enable local EIS staff to track upcoming due dates such as initial IFSP meetings.

Alaska completed the following (SPP) improvement activities in FFY09:

- State EI/ILP program continued efforts on tele-health technology opportunities and partnered with the Governor's Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Rural Services Ad Hoc Committee to improve indicator 7 (45 day timeline) through the use of Tele-health services. This work continues into FFY 2010.
- State EI/ILP program continued to provide a forum for innovative local programs to share methods and strategies with all local programs on strategies used to meet 45 day timeline during the annual EIS Coordinator Conference and monthly EIS Coordinator teleconferences.
- State EI/ILP program staff provided technical assistance and training to local EIS programs specifically related to improvement strategies for meeting the 45 day timeline. Corrective action plans included requirements for indicator 7 improvement for all local EIS programs below 100%.

Indicator 7 Progress Table						
Measurable and Rigorous Target	Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009	Actual Data FFY09 2009-2010

2008-2009						
100%	71%	88%	85.5%	84%	93.04%	99.39%

Note: Alaska Part C identified noncompliance in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 through cyclical onsite monitoring. For FFY 2008 and beyond, Alaska Part C reflects findings identified through analysis of census data collected by its Part C database.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 93.04%

a. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009)	4
b. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	4
c. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

a. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
b. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	na
c. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected: Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2008 (indicator 7) findings.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent):

Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2008 findings to ensure that (1) each local EIS program is correctly implementing the 45-day timeline requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and the Alaska Part C data system; and that each local EIS program (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

Local EIS programs with findings of noncompliance in FFY 2008 received:

- on-site monitoring visits
- corrective action plans
- local EIS staff training (IDEA Part C requirements and Alaska Part C database management)

- on-site technical assistance including monthly file review and
- quarterly progress reporting.

Alaska Part C also provided the following general supervision activities statewide FFY 2009:

- monthly Part C & EIS coordinator teleconferences
- monthly Database Teleconferences
- annual EIS coordinator face to face meeting
- annual EIS staff training opportunities
- initiation of Part C training modules for EIS professional competency.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance:

Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2007 (indicator 7) findings.

a. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2010, FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	0
b. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected	na
c. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:

Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2007 (indicator 7) findings.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2007 findings.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable):

a. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2010, FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	1
b. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has verified as corrected	1
c. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected: Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2006 findings.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier:

Alaska Part C verified correction of 1 EIS program through on-site monitoring, monthly file reviews and local EIS quarterly reporting. The EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the Alaska FFY 2008 data reported for this indicator: (1) has documented and consistently demonstrated correction with implementing 100% timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) based on updated data through the state data system; and (2) initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner (unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006:

The State team conducted a root cause analysis with the local EIS program. Alaska Part C revised the local EIS corrective action plan. Monthly State technical assistance was provided to review local EIS child files, documentation, provider practice and data management. Numerous state database enhancements were discussed and as a result, improvements made to data management reports. Missing data were corrected/entered and additional database training/support provided. The local EIS conducted staff training and reported progress to the state quarterly.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.	All Alaska Part C FFY 2009 noncompliance was verified as corrected within 12 months of findings.
<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>Alaska Part C reports in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and the Part C State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for all children whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>Alaska Part C reports, in the FFY 2009 APR, the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2006 was corrected.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>Alaska Part C reports full correction with the one remaining noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2006.</p> <p>Alaska Part C reviewed improvement strategies with key stakeholders, including ICC. These improvement strategies are reflected in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY09: There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

Indicator 8A: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

A IFSPs with transition steps and services

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.

Applied:

462 children exiting Part C who had an IFSP with transition steps and services

462 children exiting Part C

$462/462 \times 100 = 100\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 100%

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children who transitioned during the reporting period (FFY 2009). Data reported in APRs prior to FFY 2008 were collected on a sample of children through cyclical onsite monitoring.

Alaska Part C ensures the transition plan, referenced in IDEA Section 637(a)(9)(c), is part of the IFSP that is developed after a child turns two and before the child reaches age three and includes appropriate transition steps and services required under IDEA Section 636(a)(3) and (d)(8).

Alaska Part C did not include in the calculation (in either the numerator or denominator) 180 children for whom the family did not choose to participate in transition planning for the following reasons:

Reasons parents did not engaging in transition planning	Number of children	Percent of children
Attempts to contact unsuccessful	57	32%

Withdrawn by parent or guardian	57	32%
Moved out of state	34	19%
No longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age 3 (completion of IFSP prior to age 3)	30	16%
Child deceased	2	1%
Total	180	100%

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning:

a. Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	462
b. Number of children exiting Part C	462
c. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2009:

Alaska Part C met the measurable and rigorous target for indicator 8a. Alaska Part C continues to demonstrate improvement for indicator 8a as evidenced by the statewide data system and on-site monitoring results.

Indicator 8a Progress Table						
<i>Measurable and Rigorous Target 2008-2009</i>	Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009	Actual Data FFY08 2009-2010
100%	95%	94%	88%	83%	99.20%	100%

Improvement Activities:

- Local EIS Program data review was a grant requirement and state EI/ILP staff provided oversight to local programs via Alaska Part C monitoring system. Data was used to improve the effectiveness of transition.
- The EI/ILP program highlighted program strategies related to successful transitions during monthly teleconferences, the annual EIS Coordinator meeting and ongoing technical assistance to ensure service delivery and data consistency.
- Local EIS programs were required to submit improvement plans based on yearly or monitor data. Corrective action plans included transition planning for local EIS programs below 100%.
- Alaska Part C reviewed its improvement activities and continues to demonstrate considerable improvement.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 99.20%

a. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009)	6
b. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	6
c. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

a. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
b. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	na
c. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2008 (Indicator 8a) findings.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent):

Alaska verified timely correction of all FFY 2008 noncompliance through Alaska's Part C data system and on-site monitoring visits.

As specified in OSEP's June 1, 2010, FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response table, Alaska Part C verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

Alaska verified timely correction of all FFY 2008 noncompliance through Alaska's Part C data system and on-site monitoring visits. On-site monitoring visits utilized root cause analysis of each area of noncompliance. Local EIS programs were required to continue to demonstrate continued compliance through monthly and quarterly reporting.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2007 (Indicator 8a) findings.

a. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2010, FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	0
b. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected	na
c. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:

Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2007 (Indicator 8a) findings.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007:

Alaska Part C verified correction of all FFY 2007 noncompliance through file review and onsite monitoring. On-site monitoring visits utilized root cause analysis of each area of noncompliance. Local EIS programs were required to continue to demonstrate continued compliance through monthly and quarterly reporting.

As specified in OSEP's June 1, 2010, FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response table, Alaska Part C verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable):

Alaska Part C verified subsequent correction of FFY 2006 noncompliance as reported in the FFY 2008 APR.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
The State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe	Alaska Part C reports in its FFY 2009 that it has verified that each local EIS program with noncompliance has corrected in accordance with IDEA requirements.

the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.	
If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.	Alaska Part C has reviewed the SPP and APR improvement plans for indicator 8a.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable): There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

Indicator 8B: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B;

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Applied:

439 children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA

447 children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B

$439/447 \times 100 = 98\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 98%

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children who exited during the reporting period (FFY 2009). Data reported in APRs prior to FFY 2008 were collected on a sample of children through cyclical onsite monitoring.

Alaska Part C adopted a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parents of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Alaska did not include in the calculation for this indicator (in either the numerator or denominator) 15 children for whom the parents opted out. Alaska Part C opt-out policy is in writing and on file with the Department as part of the State's Part C Application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I).

Alaska did not include in the calculation for this indicator (in either the numerator or denominator) 180 children who exited without notification to the LEA. Exit reasons for these children include:

Exit reasons	Number of children	Percent of children
Attempts to contact unsuccessful	57	32%
Withdrawn by parent or guardian	57	32%
Child deceased	2	1%
Moved out of state	34	19%
No longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age 3 (completion of IFSP prior to age 3)	30	16%
Total	180	100%

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Notification to LEA):

a. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA occurred	439
b. Number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	447
c. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday (Notification to LEA) (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	98%

This indicator is not a measure of the percent of all children who will shortly reach the age of eligibility for Part B but is a measurement of those children who will shortly reach the age of eligibility for Part B **and** who the State has determined are potentially eligible for Part B. Alaska Part C determined that all children qualified for Part C are potentially eligible for Part B. Alaska Part C automates notification to Alaska Part B when a Part C eligible child turns 27 months of age (or enrolls after the age of 27 months) unless a parent "opts-out" of notification/referral to Part B. All local EIS programs review the Alaska Part C opt-out policy with parents at either enrollment or initiation of transition planning near the child's 24th month of age.

24 children did not receive notification due to a miscalculation in the automated notification report. This report was sent to Part B with children whose birthdays were less than or equal to 10/17/06. Alaska Part C reported these 24 children late to Part B. The current automated report is correctly notifying Part B of all children who will shortly reach the age of eligibility for Part B.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009: Alaska Part C is below the measurable and rigorous target of 100% in FFY 2009. Eight children did not receive timely notification due to a change in the automated notification system. The notification report business rule inadvertently omitted their contact information on the Alaska Part B notification report prior to age 3. Late notification was provided. The problem is resolved and is working correctly for 100% of all Alaska Part C children to date.

Indicator 8b Progress Table						
Measurable and Rigorous Target 2008-2009	Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009	Actual Data FFY09 2009-2010
100%	95%	86%	80%	100%	99.73%	98%

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 99.73%.

a. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009)	1
b. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	0
c. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	1

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

a. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	1
b. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	1
c. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

Alaska verified subsequent correction of this indicator through file review. Clarification was provided to all local EIS agencies regarding the opt-out policy. A statewide Opt-Out form was adopted by the Alaska Part C system and posted on the state web site for accessibility.

http://www.hss.state.ak.us/ocs/InfantLearning/resources/pdf/2009_specialed.pdf

Alaska Part C Opt-Out policy and form were also included in the revised parent transition booklet (Steps Ahead at age 3, page 13) which is utilized for all transition planning.

http://www.hss.state.ak.us/ocs/InfantLearning/afterage3/ilp_stepahead.pdf

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent):

Alaska verified subsequent correction of this indicator. As specified in OSEP's June 1, 2010, FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response table, Alaska Part C verified that the one EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the LEA notification requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) in IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has provided notification to the LEA for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: Alaska Part C provided technical assistance/clarification with all local EIS providers through a monthly provider teleconference and individually for the one agency with noncompliance. Alaska Part C worked with a broad stakeholder group to design the opt-out form and the parent transition booklet for clarification of the Opt-out policy and procedures.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance:

Alaska Part C did not have findings for this indicator in FFY 2007.

a. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2010, FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	0
b. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected	na
c. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:

Alaska Part C did not have findings for this indicator in FFY 2007.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: Alaska Part C did not have findings for this indicator in FFY 2007.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable):

Alaska Part C verified timely correction of findings for this indicator in FFY 2006.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator:

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.	Alaska reports 100% compliance for FFY 2009 and subsequent correction of noncompliance for FFY 2008.
State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has provided notification to the LEA for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.	Alaska reports 100% compliance for FFY 2009 and subsequent correction of noncompliance for FFY 2008 per all federal requirements for this indicator.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010: There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

Indicator 8C: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition conferences, including reasons for delays.

Applied:

461 children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred.

462 children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B

$461/462 \times 100 = 99.78\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 99.78%

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children who transitioned during the reporting period (FFY 2009). Data reported in APRs prior to FFY 2008 were collected on a sample of children through cyclical onsite monitoring.

As specified in OSEP's June 1, 2010, FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response table, Alaska Part C verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02

Alaska included 81 children for whom the state identified the cause for delay as "exceptional family circumstances" in both the numerator and the denominator for this indicator.

Alaska Part C did not include in the calculation (in either the numerator or denominator) children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the transition conference.

Exit reasons	Number of children	Percent of children
Attempts to contact unsuccessful	57	32%
Withdrawn by parent or guardian	57	32%
Child deceased	2	1%
Moved out of state	34	19%
No longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age 3 (completion of IFSP prior to age 3)	30	16%
Total	180	100%

Children for whom delays are attributable to circumstances other than documented exceptional family circumstances, whether in the EIS program's control or outside the EIS program's control, are included in the denominator of the Alaska Part C calculation. There was one late 90-day transition conferences held 12 days late. This family moved to another EIS program within Alaska and a delay in transfer records from one local EIS program to another contributed to a late 90-day transition conference. Alaska Part C provided clarification on transfer process and database with both agencies. A new procedure is in place for timely transfer of records.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Transition Conference):

a. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred	461
b. Number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	462
c. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday (Transition Conference) (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Alaska Part C continues to demonstrate improvement for indicator 8c as evidenced by the statewide data system and verification by on-site monitoring results.

Indicator 8c Progress Table						
Measurable and Rigorous Target 2008-2009	Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009	Actual Data FFY09 2009-2010
100%	95%	85%	83%	96%	94.16%	99.78%

Improvement Activities completed:

- Local EIS Program data review was a grant requirement and state EI/ILP staff provided oversight to local programs via Alaska Part C monitoring system. Data was used to improve the effectiveness of transition.
- The EI/ILP program highlighted program strategies related to successful transitions during

monthly teleconferences, the annual EIS Coordinator meeting and ongoing technical assistance to ensure service delivery and data consistency.

- Local EIS programs were required to submit improvement plans based on yearly or monitor data. Corrective action plans included timely transition meetings for local EIS programs below 100%.
- Alaska Part C reviewed its improvement activities and continues to demonstrate considerable improvement.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance:

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 94.16%
Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2008 (Indicator 8c) findings.

a. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009)	5
b. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	5
c. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected: Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2008 (Indicator 8c) findings.

a. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
b. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	na
c. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2008 (Indicator 8c) findings.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance or FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent):

Alaska reported less than 100% Compliance for FFY 2008 for Indicator 8C.

As specified in OSEP's June 1, 2010 FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response table, Alaska Part C verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

Alaska Part C verified correction of all FFY 2007 noncompliance through file review and a desk audit. Local EIS programs were required to continue to demonstrate continued compliance through quarterly reporting.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2007 (Indicator 8c) findings.

a. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's June 2010, FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	0
b. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected	na
c. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:

Alaska Part C verified timely correction for all FFY 2007 (Indicator 8c) findings.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: Alaska utilized on-site monitoring, verification visits and data reporting to verify timely correction of noncompliance.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier

As reported in the FFY 2008 APR, Alaska verified subsequent correction for the one local EIS program with noncompliance with this indicator. This agency has been required to demonstrate continued compliance with indicator 8c through the state data system and quarterly reporting.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.	Alaska Part C verifies that each local EIS program with noncompliance has corrected in accordance with IDEA requirements.
The State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.	Alaska Part C reports in its FFY 2009 that it has verified that each local EIS program with noncompliance has corrected in accordance with IDEA requirements.

<p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>Alaska Part C has reviewed the SPP and APR improvement plans for indicator 8c.</p>
--	---

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (if applicable): There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

States are required to use the “Indicator C 9 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).

Applied:

101 findings of noncompliance.

101 corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

$101/101 \times 100 = 100\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 100%

INDICATOR C-9 WORKSHEET FFY 2009

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 through 6/30/09)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 through 6/30/09)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	7	7	7
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	na
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	na
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	na
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	na
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	4	4	4
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na

APR – Part C (5)

ALASKA Draft 11/15/10
for public comment

8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	6	6	6
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	5	5	5
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
14. Timely and Accurate Data Reporting	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	4	4	4
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Policies and Procedures of Prior Written Notice (303.403(b))	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	15	15	15
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Parental consent obtained (303.404(a))	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	5	5	5
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na

APR – Part C (5)

ALASKA Draft 11/15/10
for public comment

OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Information is provided to families in their native language (303.403(c)), (303.323(a)), (303.342(d)(1)(ii))	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	2	2	2
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Two or more disciplines or professions were involved in provision of integrated and coordinated services. (303.17)	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	7	7	7
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: The initial evaluation/assessment identify present levels of functioning and the unique needs of the child. (303.322(c)(3))	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	3
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: The initial evaluation and assessment include child's current developmental status and include a review of pertinent information from other sources. (303.17, 303.322(c)(3)(i))	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: The family identify its resources, priorities and concerns related to enhancing their child's development and provide information about everyday routines and activities through a family-directed assessment. (303.322(d))	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	5	5	5
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: The IFSP outcomes stated to reflect family priorities, concerns and resources. ((303.12(a)(2))	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	6	6	6
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: IFSP outcomes measurable. (303.12 (a)(1), 303.344 (c))	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	9	9	9
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na

APR – Part C (5)

ALASKA Draft 11/15/10
for public comment

OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Services and supports identified in the IFSP designed to enhance the capacity of the family in meeting the developmental needs of their child. (303.322(d)(1))	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	4	4	4
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: IFSPs are reviewed and renewed according to required timelines. (303.342(b)(1) and (c))	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	8	8	8
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: All services provided as specified on the IFSP. (303.12)	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	9	9	9
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	na
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			101	101
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	100.00%

Describe the process for selecting EIS programs for Monitoring: Alaska Part C monitors local EIS performance through its statewide data system for all children. Annual self assessments are completed to examine other areas of noncompliance and related requirements. Local EIS programs with less than required targets receive additional state technical assistance, on-site monitoring visits, root cause analysis and verification visits as needed. Local EIS agencies for whom correction was not within 12 months of finding in FFY2007 received monitoring visits with root cause analysis, corrective action plan revisions and follow-up verification visits. All longstanding noncompliance reported in FFY 2007 has been subsequently corrected.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2009: Enhancements were implemented to the Alaska Part C data system allowing local EIS programs to complete quarterly reporting and self assessments online. Automated report cards and quarterly narrative reports were examined in third quarter FFY 2009 to inform state staff of needed technical assistance and compliance correction. Agencies with noncompliance received on-site monitoring visits, root cause analysis and corrective action plans (CAP) (or revised corrective action plans if agency had a CAP in place). Agencies with corrective action plans were required to conduct additional monthly file reviews and report to state staff verification of continued compliance. Timely on-site monitoring and assistance to grantees contributed to Alaska's Part C indicator 9 correction.

Timely Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

a. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	53
b. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	41
c. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	12

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

a. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	12
b. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	12
c. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected

Alaska Part C verified correction of all FFY 2008 noncompliance, including subsequently corrected compliance, through on-site visits, desk audits, quarterly data reports and file reviews. Local EIS agencies for whom correction was not within 12 months of finding received monitoring visits with root cause analysis, corrective action plans and follow-up verification visits.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 findings (either timely or subsequent)

As specified in OSEP's June 1, 2010, FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table, Alaska Part C verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction in FFY 2009 of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008:

One Local EIS agency received on-site monitoring, root cause analysis, staff training specific to indicators 7 (45-day timeline), 8a (transition planning), prior written notice, and multidisciplinary evaluation and assessment. This agency reviewed its policies and procedures with state staff, provided monthly file reviews to demonstrate maintenance of correction. This agency changed its service model from direct service to primary coaching. This agency provided extensive training on this model was provided. The state staff also provided additional data system training and monthly support for accurate/timely data entry, and use of database administrative reports to track child and agency progress.

Alaska Part C provided statewide training on prior written notice, developed a standardized prior written notice form. This form is available on the Alaska Part C web site for easy access:

http://www.hss.state.ak.us/ocs/InfantLearning/resources/pdf/ilp_priornotice.pdf

Additional uncorrected noncompliance, reported FFY 2008 in indicator 9 was included in local EIS program corrective action plans as needed. Follow up included on-site verification visits and additional monthly technical assistance as needed.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)

For FFY 2007 findings that the State has not yet corrected, explain what the State has done to identify the root cause(s) of continuing noncompliance, and what the State is doing about the continued lack of compliance, including, as appropriate, enforcement actions taken against an EIS program that continues to show noncompliance.

If the State reported less than 100% for this indicator in its FFY 2007 APR and did not report that the remaining FFY 2007 findings were subsequently corrected, provide the information below:

a. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings noted in OSEP's June 2010 FFY 2008 APR response table for this indicator	0
b. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected	na
c. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable)

Alaska has corrected all prior noncompliance from FFY 2006 and earlier.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501, and OSEP Memo 09-02.	Alaska reviewed its improvement planning with stakeholders. Additional statewide training and data system enhancements were recommended and implemented.
State must report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.	Alaska Part C verified that all correction of noncompliance was in keeping with federal and state requirements.
In responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.	Alaska reports correction and improvement activities in each indicator as required, specifically for indicators 1,7,8a, 8b, 8c in this APR.
In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.	Alaska includes the indicator 9 worksheet in the body of indicator 9 under explanation of actual FFY 2009 target data.
The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and the one remaining finding identified in FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR were corrected.	Alaska reports in indicator 1 correction of longstanding noncompliance (from FFY 2006) and in indicator 9 subsequent correction of prior written notice noncompliance (From FFY 2007).

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010: There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: No actual target data available, no written complaints were made during FFY 2009.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009: Alaska's 2009 family survey indicates an increase in families reportedly knowing their rights:

FFY 2008	FFY 2009
88.7%	90.8%

Alaska completed the following improvement activities in FFY 2009:

- Alaska Part C completed revision of child and family rights materials. Printing this material was postponed in expectation of federal regulation changes. Statewide distribution is expected in FFY 2010. These materials will also be posted on the Alaska statewide EI/ILP web site when complete.
- Continued training was conducted through the monitoring process and topical teleconferences and included parent procedural safeguards, how to file a complaint, etc. Alaska Part C developed a standardized prior written notice form and posted it to the Alaska Part C web site. State staff completed an annual review of renewal rates of receipt of parent's rights through the self-assessment and the family outcomes survey.
- Alaska Part C continued its collaboration with the Alaska Parent Training and Information Center through the Alaska Stone Soup Group to provide parents, educators and statewide partners special education support and training; including parent rights training.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: No actual target data available, no due process hearing requests were made during FFY 2009

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Alaska completed the following improvement activities in FFY 2009:

- Training continued through the FFY 2009 monitoring process to ensure that parents understand procedures for filing complaints and full due process.
- Local EI/ILP agencies provided annual review of parent's rights through the local agency self-assessment. This assessment asks reviewers to document parent receipt of rights and review of materials with each enrolled family. Results of this assessment demonstrate all families are reviewing child and family rights at intake.

See discussion of activities for indicator #10 for explanation of the Alaska EI/ILP due process procedures and update of these materials. The State EI staff will continue to work with the state Parent Training Initiative grant and the Alaska ICC in FFY 2010 to ensure effective dissemination of parent trainings.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	NA

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: NA

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009: Not applicable Alaska Part C does not use Part B due process procedures.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision****Indicator 13:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: No actual target data available, no mediation requests received.**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:** Refer to previous description in indicator #10.**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:**

There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

States are required to use the "Indicator 14 Data Rubric" for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 100%

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 14			
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Total
1	1	1	2
2	1	1	2
3	1	1	2
4	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
6	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8a	1	1	2
8b	1	1	2
8c	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2

APR – Part C (5)

ALASKA Draft 11/15/10
for public comment

11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
		Subtotal	30
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2008 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		35

618 Data - Indicator 14					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 2 - Program Settings Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 4 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	12
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 2.5) =		30

Indicator #14 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	35.00

B. 618 Grand Total	30.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	65.00
Total NA in APR	0.00
Total NA in 618	5.00
Base	65.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	1.000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.0

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

All automated Child Count database reports have been reviewed for accuracy by the Data Manager and IT staff. Modifications were implemented and tested in FFY 2008 to assure accurate reporting. All 618 data reports are now reviewed by both the Part C Data Manager and Senior Database Programmer Analyst. Alaska Part C has taken the following additional steps to ensure improvement and maintained indicator 14 compliance:

1. Ensuring Valid, Accurate and Timely Data:

Data gathered through our enhanced accountability system and monitoring was used to inform and drive decisions related to resource allocation, need for technical assistance, and assigned monitoring. The Alaska web database incorporates data editing procedures to verify accurate and complete data, for example, date of birth values yield child age less than 3 years, if not, the end-user is alerted to an error in the date. Reportable data is validated with dropdown lists and required fields.

Each local EIS program reviews their data quarterly for completeness and accuracy using the automated data compliance, reminders and data confirmation reports. Data that is missing or inaccurate is flagged on these reports and allows end-users to drill down into each child record for examination and/or correction prior to verification. State Part C staff review each EIS data cleaning reports prior to quarter end and provide technical assistance to any local program with data issues.

The Alaska web database tracks the receipt of timely local EIS data verification. The Part C Data Manager tracks email requests for verification extensions (late data verification). Each State Program Specialist reviews requests for extensions and either approves or disapproves these requests. If more than one agency is having difficulties with the database or the required verification report, the Part C Data Manager notifies the database programmer(s) and requests support for database maintenance. An email regarding database improvements/fixes is then sent out to local EIS programs and posted to the web database forum.

Upon receipt of verification, an automated email is sent to the State Program Specialists and Part C Data Manager that a local EIS agency has verified their quarterly data. Program Specialists reviews annual trend data for each compliance indicator, noting increases or decreases in trend data and non-compliance. Each agency with non-compliance is required to submit a plan of correction per indicator at the time of verification. Verification and corrective action plans are then reviewed for approval by the Program Specialists within 30 days of receipt. Verification, plans of correction and

approvals are tracked through the database and reviewed for APR preparation and local determinations annually. Alaska uses year-to-year comparisons and trend lines as a reliability check for annually reported data (both to OSEP and for public reporting).

2. Validity and Validation

Providers and local agency staff have the first level of responsibility for submitting accurate data. Alaska policies and procedures have been implemented that assist, incentivize, reward, review, correct and ensure timely and accurate data submittals. Local agency staff is required to run reports that assist in summarizing compliance measures and finding discrepancies. Quarterly statewide teleconferences are held with local agencies to review statewide aggregate data. Comparing compliance results provides incentive to improve results.

All data reports follow OSEP measurement guidance. State Part C staff, programmers and local EIS agencies scrutinize business rules for each compliance indicator. Rigorous testing procedures are followed for new and revised data reports.

State monitoring teams review local EIS policies and procedures to ensure that data collection and entry is consistent with State of Alaska Part C requirements and guidelines. On-site file reviews compare database information with child file. Annual self-assessment procedures require local EIS file reviews of child records to ensure accurate data entry.

Database Training is provided to all new direct service and data personnel across the state. Training focuses on accurate data entry, definitions, reporting and data management. Follow-up and ongoing training information is provided through monthly database teleconference (open to all users) and a database forum.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010:

There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.